

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This Amendment is being filed in response to the Final Office Action dated September 29, 2008. Reconsideration and allowance of the application in view of the amendments provided above and the remarks to follow are respectfully requested.

Claims 11-30 are pending in the Application.

In the Office Action, claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as allegedly being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree with and explicitly traverse this ground for rejecting Claims 21-30. It is the Applicants' position that the claims require statutory subject matter. However, in the interest of furthering the prosecution of this matter, Applicants have elected to amend the claims to more clearly state the invention. Specifically, Applicants have amended claim 21 to more clearly state a player device ..., and have amended claim 28 to more clearly state an information carrier object ... No new matter is added by this amendment nor should a further search be required as a search of devices and information carrier objects has been previously performed. Clearly, claims 21-30 require statutory subject matter. Accordingly, it is

respectfully requested that the amendment to the claims be entered and that the rejection of claims 21-30 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 11-19, 21 and 23-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,987,611 to Freund ("Freund"). Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Freund in view of U.S. Patent Publication No 2005/005165 to Morgan ("Morgan"). Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Freund in view of U.S. Patent Publication No 2003/0040341 to Casais ("Casais"). It is respectfully submitted that claims 21-30 are allowable over Freund alone and in view of any combination of Morgan and Casais for at least the following reasons.

The Applicants want to thank the Examiner for the detailed explanation of how Freund was being interpreted in the Office Action. However, it is the Applicants position that a list of Applications and URLs can not both be content information and application information related to the content information as seems to be the conclusion drawn in paragraph 19 of the Office Action. However, in the interest of expediting consideration and allowance of the pending claims, the Applicants have elected to amend the claims to clarify that which is recited in the claims.

It is respectfully submitted that the method of claim 11 is not anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Freund. For example, Freund does not disclose or suggest, a method that amongst other patentable elements, comprises (illustrative emphasis provided) "receiving content information and application information related to the content information from an information carrier, wherein the content information includes at least one of audio content and video content received from the information carrier; determining a sub-collection of documents based on the application information, facilitating Internet access to documents within the sub-collection, and encumbering Internet access to documents that are not within the sub-collection" as recited in claim 11, and as similarly recited by each of claims 21 and 28. Morgan and Casais cited for allegedly showing features of the dependent claims and as such, does not cure the noted deficiencies of Freund.


Based on the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 11, 21 and 28 are patentable over Freund alone and in view of either of Morgan and Casais and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited. Claims 12-20, 22-27 and 29-30 respectively depend from one of claims 11, 21 and 28 and

accordingly are allowable for at least this reason as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of the claims. Accordingly, separate consideration and allowance of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In addition, Applicants deny any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, the Applicants reserve the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

Applicants have made a diligent and sincere effort to place this application in condition for immediate allowance and notice to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Gregory L. Thorne, Reg. 39,398  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
November 26, 2008

**THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP**  
Applied Technology Center  
111 West Main Street  
Bay Shore, NY 11706  
Tel: (631) 665-5139  
Fax: (631) 665-5101